

From: Andy McCown
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/23/02 11:19am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To: Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Under the Tunney Act, I'd like to comment on the proposed Microsoft settlement.

Since I'm sure you have plenty of these to go through, I will keep my comments short.

As a software developer of many years, who has programmed on Unix, Linux, Windows, and Mac platforms, I feel the proposed settlement does little to remedy the situation. If the proposed settlement is followed, it will go a small way towards improving the situation. However, some areas will not be aided at all because the proposed settlement terms are too narrow (no opening of file formats, no stop of intentional incompatibilities). These issues have been well addressed by other people.

My goal is to point out that the proposed settlement seems to do nothing as a penalty to Microsoft. It kindly asks them to behave better in the future, places difficult to properly enforce measures on them, and then, in the end, allows them or even encourages them to keep the monopoly that they illegally built! Is this justice? I'm afraid the only way to make headway against their illegal gained monopoly is indeed to break up the company - but not as originally proposed. It should be broken into three companies, each one with the same set of source code and products. Then there will be competition!

Just my comments that the proposed settlement does not go far enough and does not address all the issues that it should. The proposed settlement is not in the public interest, and needs significant revisions.

Andrew McCown